115

(2)

No. 08-383

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
DEC 3 - 2008
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The Supreme Court of the United States

MARVIN EARL THOMPSON
Petitioner

Versus

HOWARD BROTHERS INC. D/B/A
HOWARD BROTHERS RENTAL
Respondent

PETITION FOR REHEARING

MARVIN EARL THOMPSON
(PRO SE)
302 LANGFORD DRIVE
NORCROSS, GA 30071
(678) 755-4434

PARTIES

Names of Petitioner: Marvin Earl Thompson (Pro Se)
Address: 302 Langford Drive
Norcross, GA 30071
(678) 755-4434

Name of Respondents: Howard Brothers Inc. D/B/A,
Howard Brothers Rental
6884 Buford Hwy
Doraville, GA 30340
(770) 449-1819
On petition for a Writ of Certiorari
To the United State Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuits

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PARTIES i
TABLE OF CONTENTS ii
PETITION FOR REHEARING 1
BACKGROUND 2
FAMILIARITY 4
ARGUMENT 6
FACTS AND CONCLUSION 10
APPEAL FOR JUSTICE 11

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Marvin Earl Thompson hear by petitioned the Supreme Court of the United States for a Writ of Certiorari from the United States Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit, in this case where Petitioner seek a trial for malicious prosecutions by Howard Brothers Rental. The Court of Appeal denied the case on April 21, 2008. The Petition concern whether the Fourth Amendment requires suppression of evidence obtained when a police officer makes an arrest based on probable cause, supported by Oath of affirmation, and the person or things to be seized. Also, the Petition concerns whether the Six Amendment was violated with bogus motions and tampered evidence to prolong or prevent a trial.

BACKGROUND/FACTS

On August 9, 2000 I arrived home at 12:00 p.m. with one of my employees name Michael Stanley Snow. Michael stayed in my truck while I went into my home to use the rest room. Shortly after, detectives arrived at my home knocking at the door. I asked who's there. The detectives answered, the Gwinnett County Police. Detective Rivera and a black male detective were standing with a warrant in hand for my arrest. They stated they had a video tape showing me stealing a chain saw at the, Howard Brothers Rental. Detective Rivera pointed at my Ford truck and said that is the truck that was at the crime scene, but after reviewing the police report it was a 1978 Chevy pickup truck at the crime scene which I sold to a Philip Bailey. However, Rivera searched my Ford truck looking for a chain saw.

Later on, a police officer drove up to my home joining with the two detectives in my yard. Detective Rivera then handcuffed me and the police officer placed me in the back of the police car and drove me to the Norcross precinct located on Jimmy Carter Blvd. The police officer along with the two detectives took me inside for questioning approximately thirty minutes. Rivera persistently asked, "Did you steal the chain saw?" "I answered no; I don't steal, and you have the wrong person." Then I asked if I could see the video tape, Rivera stated that the video was at the crime lab, and he continued to persistently ask did you steal the chain saw. I continued answering, no.

I began talking to Detective Rivera, asking him to call Doug Howard, whom I knew personally. Rivera said that he would not call Doug Howard of Howard Brothers Rental, but he would call the Howard Brother's store of crime location. The phone call took place on a speaker phone, a female answered, and Rivera asks to speak to the store Manager Matthew Chambers. Chambers asked, "How may I help you?" Rivera stated, "We have Mr. Marvin Thompson in custody is he the person who stole the chain saw?" Matthew Chambers answered "Yes he is the one," Rivera said, "thank you," and hung the phone up. Rivera ordered me to stand up and the police in uniform handcuffed me, and escorted me out of the

building and put me in the police car and drove me to the Gwinnett County Jail where I was booked and jailed.

October 2000, I received a call from the owner; Doug Howard stating we made a mistake identifying you, Marvin, as the perpetrator. Doug Howard also said, he spoke with his brother John Howard, and they both wanted to compensate me; but they never did.

Prior to June 8, 2000, I sold the 1978 Chevy pick-up truck to Philip Bailey. Philip Bailey sold it to Larry Jones, and Larry Jones brother, Philip Jones went into the Howard Brother's store in the 1978 Chevy pick-up truck and stole the chain saw. I was wrongfully arrested without legal factual justification, wrongfully prosecuted even after the Respondents was told and knew I was not the perpetrator, and wrongful initiation and encouragement/continuation of the criminal prosecution (#01-B-3928-3), of me by Respondents; Even after the Respondents were told and knew I was not the perpetrator. Other words, the respondent legally and maliciously subjected me to prosecution.

After four long years of fighting the Respondents lies and misrepresentations to the state. Petitioner was indicted during the August, 2000 term by Gwinnett County for the offense of theft by taken. I pleaded not guilty to the above mentioned charge in my arraignment. On March 8, 2004, I was able to obtain an Acquittal and Absolute Discharge ("Acquittal") from the superior Court of Gwinnett County. I spent over $10,000.00 defending the criminal charge and another $2,500.00 in getting said Acquittal.

On October 9, 2006 a Motion Hearing was held for my Civil Action case in the Superior Court of Gwinnett County; the judge ordered the Howard Brother's Attorney (M Scott Barksdale) to produce Detective Rivera in court Civil Action file No. 05-A-14602-6 October 9, 2006 pg 36 lines 4-13. The video tape was never viewed in court, and viewing of the video tape is relevant to the fact. In my attorney Brian Whiteside deposition he talks about how you can only see the guy back of his head in the video, Civil Action File No. 05-A-14602-6 deposition of Brian Whiteside May 8, 2006 Pg 28 lines 24-25; pg 29 lines 1-25; pg 30 lines 1-11, but in Detective Rivera sealed

deposition he said you can see the guy face, etc; Civil Action file No. 01-A-7968-6 April 22, 2003 deposition of Detective Rivera, page 16 lines 15-25; page 20 lines 15-23; page 21 lines 10-13.

A Motion for Reconsideration was filed January 26, 2007; Amended Notice of Appeal was filed April 3, 2007. The Court of Appeals issued an order denying the application for Amended Notice of Appeal on January 7, 2008. I filed a Motion for Reconsideration with the Court of Appeals on January 17, 2008. The Court of appeals issued on order denying the Motion for Reconsideration on January 24, 2008. Lastly, on February 1, 2008, I filed in the Court of Appeals a Notice to Intention to Apply for Writ of Certiorari to the Georgia Supreme Court it was also denied. On April 21, 2008. After that, I filed a Motion for Reconsideration, it also was denied on May 27, 2008.

FAMILIARITY

On many occasion, upon entering Howard Brothers Rental, Doug Howard greeted me by my first name followed by a handshake. Matthew Chambers and Joel know me by both name and face. There were other Howard Brother employees whom I have dealt with that only knew me by face. I have submitted receipts of transactions from some of my visits to Howard Brothers Rental. This clearly shows that I have an established relationship with Howard Brothers and their employees since reported October 22, 1997 through August 03, 2000. Howard Brothers reported a theft of a chain saw on June 8, 2000; I was arrested on August 9, 2000 for the theft of a chain saw. It is a fact, that between June 8, 2000 and August 9, 2000, I had made two additional visits to the Howard Brother Rental store to buy equipment prior to my arrest day. On July 6, 2000, I made a purchased of rotor, starterspring, invoice No 246845. On August 3, 2000, I purchased a battery and also, a belt for my mower, Invoice No. 080305-0029.

I visited and made purchase with the Howard Brothers Rental on:

10-22-97	Tank, Fuel Carburetor Assy	149926
11-12-97	Carburetor Assy	151763
6-23-99	Blades	062314-0053 21
6-23-99	Washer, bolt	062314-0066 21
6-3-00	Labor Repair	070305-0011
5-28-99	Parts	052806-0002 76
8-3-00	Battery belt	080305-002930
9-22-99	Padlock	092211-0089 59
6-18-99	Viperline	061814-0020 52
5-9-00		525992
9-22-99	Clips	092211-0115 59
5-12-00	Toro 44 inch blade	051206-0001 07
4-15-00	Rope	041505-0009 30
4-6-99	Lock	0400611-0111 59
4-23-98	Toro	500871
5-1-98	12.5 HP Kaw Traction	166877
4-6-99	44 side Discharge	199480
	12.5 HP Kaw Traction	
4-7-99	26CC Trimmer	199559
5-12-99	Service, Line Trimmer	204255
5-20-99	Filter, Air Kaw	205275
6-1-99	Spark Plug	206739
6-1-99	Repair Kit	206745
6-1-99	Filter, Air Stihl	206741
6-3-99	Back Pack Blower	207013
6-23-99	Switch, Blade	209289
7-16-99	Carb. Assy	212063
8-28-99	Belt, Traction	217146
9-22-99	Back Pack Blower	219654
11-22-99	Recoil, Repair	225041
12-20-99	Toro repair	226913
2-29-00	Trigger, Throttle	231988
4-6-00	Spark Plug	2361185
5-8-00	Grease	2400266
5-8-00	Filter, Air Kaw	240265
5-9-00	Bearing, Trans Fender	240452
5-12-00	Belt	240935
5-31-00	Rental Contract	053105-00250 17

7-6-00 Rotor starter spring 246845

ARGUMENT

A Motion for Summary Judgment should only be granted where there is no genuine issue of material fact to be determined by the trier of fact. In this case such a motion should have only been granted where there is genuine issue of material fact regarding whether the Respondent Malicious Prosecuted the Petitioner. In other words only if the arresting Detective independently relied on his own judgment, though in error, in arresting and prosecuting the Petitioner. The law and evidence shows without question that there are numerous genuine issues of material fact to be decided by the trier of fact. The Petitioner hereby moves this Honorable Court to overturn the decision of the lower court because: (1) The actions and statements of the arresting Detective; and, (2) The actions and statements of the District Attorney undeniably present numerous genuine issues of material fact to be decided by the trier of fact.

(1) THE ACTIONS AND STATEMENTS OF THE ARRESTING DETECTIVE

It is widely understood that when police officers have reached and independent decision based on their own and independent viewing and judgment of a video tape they would simply arrest the suspect and take the suspect to the jail. In this case because the officers did not reach an independent judgment they took the Petitioner to question him and called the alleged victims to ask if the Petitioner was the perpetrator before they took the Petitioner to jail.

(2) THE ACTIONS AND STATEMENTS OF THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Based on the Court recorded document (the District Attorney's Motion To Nolle Prosequi), the District Attorney states that **"Upon interviewing for trial the witness who identified the Defendant and who knows Defendant as a customer, she states that it is a "possibility" that the Defendant is the one stole the chain saw. Therefore, the state cannot prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt."** This also shows that the

Detective did not reach an independent judgment, but that they had relied on the Respondent. Besides the District Attorney would have mentioned the Detective if there had been exclusive independent judgment by the Detective.

In the Affidavit of Terrie Waits, (witness) dated September 28, 2006 Numbers 2 & 3 Witness Terrie Waits stated:

2.

I was the head cashier at the Howard Brothers Doraville store at the time of the theft of the chainsaw from that store (June 8, 2000), and I recall waiting on the man who stole the chain saw. I can only describe him as a black male, who was wearing jeans, a tee shirt and a baseball hat. I was standing behind the register while the Assistant Manager, Chris Golden, was helping the man. Chris showed the man some chain saws and Chris brought one of the chain saw up to the counter, and he asked me for a price, and I got it for him. At that time, the man ran out of the door with the chainsaw, loaded it into the back of the truck and drove off. Both Chris and I ran out after him and we got the tag number of the truck he was driving. I provided a description of the man, his truck and the tag number to the Gwinnett County Police. I never knew that this individual was Marvin Thompson. I did not know Marvin Thompson. I was never shown a picture of Marvin Thompson to see if he was the man that robbed the store. I know that our store had a surveillance videotape, but I never viewed the videotape. I did not initiate or press for the arrest of anyone for this crime, because I did not know who committed it.

3.

I have no malice or ill will toward Mr. Thompson; I never used his name or implicated him in any way to the police as the perpetrator of this crime.

However, in Detective Rivera sworn deposition dated April 22, 2003 pg 4 line 16-25; pg 5 line 1-25; pg 6 line 1-20; pg 7 line 1-25

clearly shows Terrie Waits was one of the witnesses present at the Howard Brothers store during the viewing of the videotape, and gave more statements to Detective Rivera telling him that, they recognize me (Marvin) from previous occasions of renting some equipment there. Detective Rivera, also stated in his deposition that he was provided with a copy of my driver license, and stated since they (Howard Brothers employees) recognized my face, they went back to their store files, and found my face on a copy of a driver license that they had made of me (required during rental) and that's how they made a positive identification of me. Howard Brothers Rental employees stated, although they knew there store had surveillance video tape, that they never viewed the videotape.

However, Detective Rivera stated in his 4-22-2003 deposition. Page 4 lines 22-25, page 5 lines 1-10, page 5 lines 22-25,page 6 lines 1-4, page 7 lines 2-15. That during the viewing of the video tape at, Howard Brothers Rental, there were witnesses present, and one manager. Rivera stated that the manager set the video system up for him. Detective Rivera also stated that he asked the manager to set the video tape up to the point where we're at, where you're trying to show me.

Detective Rivera was asked (in his 4-22-2003 deposition) page 7 lines 12-15. "So the store manager told you that Marvin Thompson had been there before, and THEY recognized him from the VIDEO TAPE? Detective Rivera answered, SURE. These statements do create doubt as to weather or not both Howard Brother employees and Detective Rivera's statements are creditable.

Howard Brothers Rental also creates doubt as to weather or not it suppressed valuable information in regards to not producing Detective Rivera in court. When the Judge ordered the Howard Brother's attorney (M Scott Barksdale) to produce Detective Rivera in court (Civil Action File No. 05-A-14602-6 October 9, 2006 page 36 lines 4-13). **HE NEVER PRODUCED HIM.** In part three of Terrie Waits affidavit, she stated, "I never used his name or implicated him in any way to the police as the perpetrator of the crime. However Detective Rivera, April 22, 2003 deposition pg 7 line 13-15 states

that I (Mr. Thompson) had been there before, and that they (witnesses) recognize me from the videotape. Also, on pg 7 line 22-25 Detective Rivera 2003 deposition when asked whether witnesses stated they were sure that it was Marvin Thompson; they stated to Detective Rivera that they were sure. Although witness, Terrie Waits, confirmed in her September 28, 2006 affidavit that assistant manager, Chris Golden, was present and a witness to the theft of the chain saw. In Detective Rivera April 22, 2003 deposition pg 15 lines 15-18, Detective Rivera also named Mr. Golden as a witness. However, there is no known affidavit of Mr. Golden.

FACTS AND CONCLUSION

In Detective Rivera, April 22, 2003 sworn deposition pg 4 line 24-25 and pg 5 line 1. Detective Rivera was asked, "Now, during the viewing of the videotape, who was present? Detective Rivera answered, I believe the witnesses were present and possibly one of the managers that actually knows about the video system. Also, Detective Rivera sworn 2003 deposition pg 4 line 16- 25; pg 5 line 1-25; pg 6 line 1-20; pg 7 line 1-25 indicates that Detective Rivera did not draw an independent conclusion. Although Detective Rivera himself recognize the person on the videotape to be Mr. Thompson as stated in the deposition of Detective Rivera, Civil Action File No. 01-A-7968-6 dated April 22, 2003 pg 72 line 13-25; pg 73 line 1-3. However, there is evidence that Detective Rivera did not draw an independent conclusion aside from Howard Brothers.

The District Attorney, Mr. David Fife and Detective Rivera report creates a legitimate discrepancy. I am subpoenaing the files of District Attorney, David Fife, of Gwinnett County. I ask The United States Supreme Court for its power in support of a subpoena.

APPEAL FOR JUSTICE

There are issues of facts to be determined by the jurors.

1. The alleged independent judgment of Detective Richard Rivera.

Although Mr. Rivera said he was independent, there are issues of facts surrounding the investigation that could lead a jury to conclude that Mr. Rivera was not independent in his decision. The fact that the respondents was familiar with the petitioner, and that the respondents was told and knew that the wrong doer in the video was not the petitioner. There's factual evidence that Howard Brothers employees viewed the video tape and went to their store files and gave Detective Rivera a copy of the petitioner driver license.

District Attorney, Mr. David Fife's Indictment Verdit (Indictment 01-B-3928-3). In support, the District Attorney shows the Court that there is insufficient evidence of identity. This is a theft by shoplifting case in which the perpetrator ran out of the store with a chain saw. Upon interviewing for trial the witness who identified the Defendant and who knows Defendant as a customer, she states that it is a "possibility" that the Defendant is the one who stole the chain saw. Therefore, the state cannot prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt.

CERTIFICATE OF PRO SE PARTY ON REHEARING

I, MARVIN EARL THOMPSON, HEREWITH CERTIFY that the Petition for Rehearing is restricted to the grounds for rehearing permissible by Rule 44(6) of the Supreme Court Rules, and that the Petition is presented in good faith and not for delay.

Dated: December 15, 2008

MARVIN EARL THOMPSON (PRO SE)
302 Langford Dr.
Norcross, GA 30071
(678) 755-4434

"APPENDIX A"

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GWINNETT COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA

STATE OF GEOGIA	:	
vs.	:	**Indictment 01-B-3928-3**
MARVIN EARL THOMPSON	:	

MOTION FOR NOLLE PROSEQUI

Now comes the District Attorney of Gwinnett County and moves this Court for consent to enter a nolle prosequi in the above-styled case. In support, the District Attorney shows the Court that there is insufficient evidence of identity. This is a theft by shoplifting case in which the perpetrator ran out of the store with a chainsaw. Upon interviewing for trial the witness who identified the defendant and who knows defendant as a customer, she states that it is a "possibility" that the defendant is the one stole the chainsaw. Therefore, the state cannot prove the case beyond a reasonable doubt.

"""""s/"""""

ORDER

The above motion having been considered by this Court, it is hereby ordered that a nolle prosequi be entered in the above styled case.

SO ORDERED, this 10 day of April, 2002.

"""""s/"""""

e.g., "Appendix A"

"APPENDIX B"

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GWINNETT COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA

STATE OF GEORGIA,	:
	: INDICTMENT NO: **01-B-3928-3**
vs.	: Charge: Felony Theft by Shoplifting
MARVIN EARL THOMPSON,	: **O.C.G.A. § 16-8-14**
	:
Defendant,	: **Former Accusation No:** *01-B-1692-3*

ORDERED FOR AN ABSOLUTE DISCHARGE AND AQUITITAL

This matter having come before this Court, in part, on ***Defendant's Motions for Absolute Discharge and Acquittal Under, in Part, the United States and Georgia Constitutions,*** this Court having previously entered nolle prosequi Orders in the above matters (see, Exhibits "A" and "B" attached hereto and incorporated herein) and the State having consented to same, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Defendant is and shall be **ABSOLUTELY DISCHANRGED and ACQUITTED** of the charges against him in the above actions; it is further

ODERED AND ADJUGED that the Clerk of Court shall enter this **Absolute Discharge and Acquittal** upon the record and docket of these cases.

SO ORDERED this 8th day of March, 2004

""""s/""""

e.g., "Appendix B"

"APPENDIX C"

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GWINNETT COUNTY
STATE OF GEORGIA

MARVIN EARL THOMPSON,

Plaintiff,

v. • Civil Action No: 05-A-14602-6

HOWARD BROTHERS, INC., dba
HOWARD BROTHERS RENTALS,

Defendant,

ORDER GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGEMENT TO DEFENDANT

The Defendant's Motions in Limine and for Summary Judgment having been se down for hearing on November 21, 2006, and after a review of the record in the case, the briefs of the parties and oral argument, it is HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

(1) Defendant's Motion in Limine requesting that the deposition of Detective Richard Rivera taken in a previous filing of this case be used in the present case pursuant to O.C.G.A.§ 9-11-32 (a) (5) is GRANTED.

(2) The Affidavits of Plaintiff and witness Michael S. Snow filed 11/20/06 with the clerk were not served, according to the evidence, upon Defendant's counsel until the day of the hearing. Said Affidavits are therefore EXCLUDED from consideration pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 9-11-6 (d).

(3) The Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED.

SO ORDERED this 27 day of December, 2006

"""s/"""

e.g., "Appendix C"

"APPENDIX D"

SECOND DIVISION

JOHNSON, P.J.,
PHIPPS and MIKELL, JJ.

NOTICE: Motion for reconsideration must be physically received in our clerk's office with ten days of the date of decision to be deemed timely filed. (Court of Appeals Rules 4 and 37, September 5, 2002)
http://www.gaappearls,us/rules/

January 7, 2008

In the Court of Appeals of Georgia

A07A1706. THOMPSON v. HOWARD BROTHERS, INC.

Marvin Thompson filed a malicious prosecution action against Howard Brothers, Inc., alleging that it had improperly identified him as a perpetrator of the theft of a chainsaw from its hardware store. Howard Brothers moved for summary judgment, and the trial court granted the motion. Thompson appeals from the trial court's summary judgment order. Because Thompson has presented no evidence of malice of want of probable cause, we affirm the trial court's summary judgment ruling.

"To prevail at summary judgment under OCGA § -11-56, the moving party must demonstrate that there is no genuine issue of material fact and that the undisputed facts, viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, warrant judgment as a matter of law. A defendant may do this by showing the court that the documents, affidavits, depositions and other evidence in the record reveal that there is no evidence sufficient to create a jury issue on at least one essential element of plaintiff's case."[1]

---

[1] (Citations and punctuation omitted.) Crozer v. Reichert, 275 Ga. 118, 121 (3) (561 SE2d 120) (2002).

In the instant case, Howard Brothers supported its motion for summary judgment with affidavits, deposition testimony and other evidences establishing that a man stole a chainsaw from its hardware store and the theft was captured on a surveillance

videotape recorder. Two store employees chased after the man and saw him put the chainsaw in the back of a pickup truck and drove away. The employees got the tag number of the truck and gave the information to the police. A police investigator discovered that the tag number belong to a truck owned by Thompson. The investigator obtained a photograph of Thompson from the Department of Motor Vehicles and was further informed by store employees that they had a copy of Thompson's driver license because he had previously done business with the store. The investigator watched the surveillance videotape of the theft and, based on the photographs he had seen of Thompson, was certain that Thompson was the man depicted on the videotape. The investigator than obtained a warrant for Thompson's arrest and a grand jury eventually indicted Thompson for theft by shoplifting.

"Action for false arrest and malicious prosecution both require evidence of malice and lack of probable cause obtains a verdict. Probable cause is absent when the circumstances would satisfy a reasonable person that the accuser had no ground for proceeding except a desire to injure the accused."[2]

---

[2](Citation and punctuation omitted.) Smith v. Trust Company Bank, 215 Ga. App. 413, 415 (1) (450 SE2d 866) (1994).

In this appeal, Thompson has citied no evidence that Howard Brothers had no ground for proceeding other than a desire to injure him. On the contrary, the evidence shows that Howard Brothers had reasonable grounds for proceeding against Thompson since his truck was used as the thief's getaway vehicle and he was positively identified by the police investigator as the person depicted on the surveillance videotape.

Moreover, it is undisputed that Thompson was indicted by a grand jury for the theft. "Although evidence of an indictment is not conclusive, it is prima facie evidence of probable cause which shifts the burden to the plaintiff's to come forward with specific facts tending to show that probable cause did not exist for his arrest and that the charges against him were instead motivated by malice."[3] Thompson has come forward with no facts tending to show that probable cause did not exist and that the charges against him were motivated by malice.

---

[3](Citations and punctuation omitted.) Tate v. Holloway, 231 Ga. App. 831, 834 (499 SE2d 72) (1998).

Indeed, his appellate brief is deficient in that it makes no meaningful citations to the record in support of his claim of error. His sole reference to the record is to four page of the investigator's deposition which, rather than supporting his claim, show that he was indentified from the videotape as the thief. [4]

[4] "Each enumerated error shall be supported in the brief by specific reference to the record or transcript. In the absence of such reference, the Court will not search for or consider such enumeration," Court of Appeals Rule 25 (c) (3) (i).

Because Thompson has failed to provide us with any evidence sufficient to create a jury issue as to the essential elements of malice and want of probable cause, we find that the trial court correctly granted summary judgment to Howard Brothers. [5]

---

[5]See Desmond v. Troncalli Mitsubishi, 243 Ga. App. 71, 74-75 (2) (532 SE2d) 463) (2000).

e.g., "Appendix D"

"APPENDIX E"

Court of Appeals
of the State of Georgia

ATLANTA, JANUARY 24, 2008

The Court of Appeals passed the following order

Case No. A07A1706

MARVIN THOMPSON V. HOWARD BROTHERS INC. D/B/A HOWARD BROTHERS RENTAL

Upon consideration of the motion for reconsideration filed in this case, it is ordered that it be hereby denied.

Court of Appeals of the State of Georgia

Clerk's Office, Atlanta, JAN 24, 2008

I certify that the above is a true extract from the minutes of the Court of Appeals, of Georgia.

Witness my signature and the seal of said court hereto affixed the day and year last above written.

Clerk.

COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA
I here certify that this is a true and correct copy of portions of case A07A1706 as they appear in the original file in the Court of Appeal of Georgia.
Date: 2/7/2008
Signature: William L. Martin, III
Clerk, Court of Appeals of Georgia
WITNESS MY SIGNATURE AND SEAL OF THE COURT OF APPEALS OF GEORGIA

e.g., "Appendix E"

"APPENDIX F"

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA
CLERK OFFICE – ALTANTA

Date: April 21, 2008

Marvin Thompson
302 Langford Drive
Norcross, GA 30071

Case No. S08C0906

MARVIN THOMPSON v. HOWARD BROTHERS, INC., d/b/a HOWARD BROTHER RENTAL

COURT OF APPEALS CASE NO. A07A1706

The Supreme Court today denied the petition for certiorari in this case.
All the Justices concur.

"/s/"

e.g., "Appendix F"

"APPENDIX G"

SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA

Atlanta, May 19, 2008

Case No. S08C0906

The Honorable Supreme Court met pursuant to adjournment. The following order was passed:

MARVIN THOMPSON v. HOWARD BROTHERS, INC., d/b/a HOWARD BROTHER RENTAL

Upon consideration of the Motion for Reconsideration filed in this case, it is ordered that it be hereby denied.

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Clerk's Office, Atlanta

I hereby certify that the above is a true extract form the minutes of the Supreme Court of Georgia. Witness my signature and the seal of said court hereto affixed the day and year last above written.

Therese S. Barnes, Clerk

e.g., "Appendix G"

"APPENDIX H"

Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

William K. Suter
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

November 10, 2008

Mr. Marvin Earl Thompson
302 Langford Drive
Norcross, GA 30071

Re: Marvin Earl Thompson
v. Howard Brothers Inc.
No. 08-383

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:
The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Sincerely,

"""/s/"""
William K. Suter, Clerk

e.g., "Appendix H"